

REMARKS

Claims 55 – 85 are currently pending in this response. Claims 55 – 85 are rejected. Claims 55, 80 and 81 are amended in this response.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected claims 55 – 85 under 35 USC 102(e), as being obvious over Helgeson et al. US Patent No. 6643652, and associated application No 2002/0073236, in view of Brown, US Patent Application No. 2003/0061317.

The Examiner initially refers to Figure 4 of Helgeson to teach a plurality of hosting servers being associated with a first unique identity and storing those identities in a software object.

However Fig. 4 of Helgeson *does not teach a software object*. It simply teaches a network of computers. Furthermore Fig. 4 of Helgeson does not teach that servers have a unique identity. While it is true that the servers in the figures have designations such as “information server”, “business server”, “interface server” etc, these are designations on the drawings for the purpose of the patent specification. These are no more unique identifications in the technical sense than are the reference numerals themselves.

Even if the Examiner persists in his view that the figure teaches the servers being uniquely identified, these identifications are not stored in an identity arrangement.

Even if the Examiner were somehow to argue that the figure teaches an identity arrangement, these identity arrangements are certainly not to be found in a software object. The Examiner is in this respect referred to paragraph 215 of Helgeson, where Fig. 4 is discussed. The discussion relates to a series of servers and their hardware and software facilities. There is no discussion of software objects, certainly no discussion of identity arrangements within these non-existent software objects and certainly no discussion of the software objects containing identity arrangements which contain unique identifications of one of the hosting servers or the provider of the object.

It is true that the passage mentions that XML may be used to communicate between the servers. However there is no teaching that XML should include a software object, and there is no teaching that XML should include an identity arrangement for identifying the hosting server. XML does not use software objects and does not include a facility for identifying the hosting server. The transportation protocol (e.g. HTTP) may specify an originating Internet protocol (IP) address, but an IP address does not necessarily identify an individual server, and this address is generally not stored, but used to send a one-off response.

Examiner states regarding the first identity arrangement “that’s XML protocol”. If the Examiner is referring to some particular version of XML then he is asked to back this up with documentary evidence. XML usually relates to static documents, where an identification of the server would have little meaning, and, to the knowledge of the applicant, does *not* include such a protocol, so this can hardly be considered to be common general knowledge, or the kind of information subject to judicial notice.

But irrespective of the above, XML does *not* relate at all to *software objects*. Therefore Fig. 4 of Helgeson does not teach software objects.

Thus the claimed features of a) the software object, b) the first identity arrangement and c) the unique identifications of the server or object providers, are not present in Helgeson either alone or in combination.

The Examiner now looks for the feature of the second identity. Here the Examiner points to paragraph 526 of Helgeson, lines 1 – 3. This passage states:

“Web content server 800 can also provide the platform’s web content generation engine for use by users to create, render and represent web content”.

Thus all this passage says is that a web server makes content available to users. Applicant is not claiming he invented making web content available to users, and the relevance of this passage to the claim is entirely unclear.

Examiner finds that this second identity may relate to a remote entity establishing a relationship with an object from paragraph 215 of Helgeson. However paragraph 215 simply talks about hardware devices communicating with each other via XML. *There are no software objects in Figure 4.* There is no indication in this passage that the remote entity has its identity stored in *any kind* of software object. There is no teaching of software object either inherent or implied in Fig. 4 since XML usually refers to static documents.

Examiner admits that Helgeson fails to teach “wherein said first and second identity arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of said at least one software object simultaneously while each one of said at least one remote software object uniquely preserves the said enablement data’s associated hosting and relationship identities”.

It is accepted that paragraph 11 of Brown teaches a software object. It is not apparent where the Examiner understands from this paragraph that *a plurality of remote objects* are accessing the *same* software object. It is certainly not clear that the software object when accessed by more than one remote user keeps its host or provider identity and adds to this the user identity. It seems more likely that the user simply tries to authenticate himself and does this through the secure sockets layer SSL, which keeps a separate key for each user.

It is accepted that paragraph 19 of Brown teaches that a user identity is passed in a request and authenticated. There is no software object mentioned in this passage, nor any indication that a software object retains its host or provider identity, nor any indication that identities of remote users are retained in any way, nor any indication that identities of pluralities of remote users are retained separately.

Examiner alleges that if Helgeson and Brown were to be combined, then the features of claim 1 would be taught.

However neither Helgeson nor Brown teach a:

“software object comprising:

enablement data,

a first identity arrangement for holding said first unique identity indicating one of said plurality of hosting servers or provider of said object, and

a second identity arrangement for holding respective second unique identities of specific remote entities establishing a relationship with said object via a network through respective remote terminal devices,

wherein said first and said second identity arrangements enable a plurality of remote entities to access said enablement data of said at least one software object simultaneously, while each one of said at least one software object uniquely preserves the said enablement data's associated hosting and relationship identities.

If an attempt were made to combine the hardware platforms of Helgeson Fig. 4 with the secure sockets layer of Brown Paragraphs 11 and 19, all one would obtain is

that a server could be provided with a secure sockets layer, which would receive communications from remote entities and would preserve the identity of the communicating remote entity, so that each entity could use its own password.

There is no teaching that the identity of the serving entity should be stored in the SSL layer and indeed this would make no sense as the SSL layer is not liable to be confused by its identity. It exists only on a single server and is not mobile. Moreover, while the identity of the remote entity is stored, this identity is not used to form part of the identifier of a software object. Indeed, the purpose of storing a remote entity identifier is merely to identify the remote entity.

Thus it is respectfully submitted that claim 55 is novel and inventive over the combination of Helgeson and Brown.

It is added that a *software object* is a term *well known in the art* of computer programming and refers to a self-contained unit –generally having state and behavior so that it acts as an autonomous unit within a program. Such software objects are commonly used in the programming style known as Object Orientated Programming or OOP.

All of the above refers to the unamended claim. Claim 1 has however been amended to further clarify that

“each one of said at least one software object uniquely preserves the said enablement data's associated said first, hosting, and said second, relationship, identities.”

Thus the claim clearly specifies that the host identity is a) stored in the software object and b) retained. Helgeson as explained has no software object or host identity. While Brown has a software entity it has *no storage of a host identity in its software object*. Furthermore it does not hint at storage of such a host identity since a secure socket layer would always *remain* on the *same host*.

The same features discussed above are likewise defined in claims 80 and 81 and these claims are therefore believed to be inventive over the combination of Helgeson and Brown for the same reasons.

Examiner's Arguments

Although the Examiner does point to Figure 4, items 419, 421 and 423 as being identity arrangements, these in fact point to servers. As mentioned above, the only identities shown in the Figures are those provided for the purpose of the patent

specification. There is no indication that the figure actually shows a technical feature of unique identities for the servers..

As regards the first identity itself, as mentinoed above, the Examiner makes the remark “that’s XML protocol”, without any supporting reference. Applicant is not aware of a protocol within XML for *mandating an identification of the hosting server or providing entity*.

Again as no software object hosted on a server is indicated the point is rendered moot by the present amendments. Indeed XML – as a mark-up language rather than a programming language per se, could not and does not support a software object. It may *at the very most* provide data for the state of the object.

For the second identity arrangement the Examiner continues to point to paragraph 526 lines 1 - 3. This paragraph however simply talks about a web content generation engine and there is no mention of any arrangement for *storing the identity of* the remote user.

The Examiner continues to point to paragraph 215 lines 10 – 14 as teaching the remote user. However lines 10 – 14 merely teach a combination of servers and hardware boxes. There are users refered to in paragraph 215, since web clients" are users. But the paragraph doesn't mention any way to *identify* them – that is, if the same set of clients reapeatedly interact with the same server, there is *no way to identify which client is which* over the course of many interactions, and again, applicant is somewhat confused at the rejection.

Conclusion

All the matters raised by the Examiner are believed to have been dealt with.

Claims 55, 80 and 81 are believed to be inventive over the combination of Hegelson and Brown, who does not teach or hint at a *software object hosted on a server*, combining together *two identity arrangements* for providing to the software object *two identification attributes* being a *hosting server identification* and a *remote user identification*.

All the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and allowance of the application is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: November 19, 2008